SENIOR LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
AT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL THOMAS B. WITT, AG

DTIC
ELECTE
JUN 2 0 1988
S D

30 MARCH 1988

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

88 6 17 006

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) Senior Leadership Assessment and Development at the United States Army War College		TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Study Project
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) LTC Thomas B. Witt		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army War College Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same		12. REPORT DATE March 1988
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 71
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(If different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, If different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

DD FORM 1473 JAN 73 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

Assessment and development of students' leadership skills is one of the curricular challenges of the U.S. Army War College. Assessment centers are a technique of predicting future job behavior by observing and evaluating performance in simulations. They are widely accepted for selection, promotion and development decisions. The techniques are now in limited use in the War College. This study explores the background of assessment center techniques in general, in the Army and at the War College. It argues that the techniques should continue to play a valuable role in War College student development and makes recommendations for improving on their present use.

UNCLASSIFIED

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

SENIOR LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
AT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

AN INDIVIDUAL STUDY PROJECT

by

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas B. Witt, AG

Dr. Herbert F. Barber
Project Adviser

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
30 March 1988

UNCLASSIFIED

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Thomas B. Witt, LTC, AG

TITLE: Senior Leadership Assessment and Development at the
            United States Army War College

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 16 February 1988   PAGES: 69   CLASSIFICATION:
            Unclassified

Assessment and development of students' leadership skills is
one of the curricular challenges of the U.S. Army War College.
Assessment centers are a technique of predicting future job
behavior by observing and evaluating performance in simulations.
They are widely accepted for selection, promotion and development
decisions. The techniques are now in limited use in the War
College. This study explores the background of assessment center
techniques in general, in the Army and at the War College. It
argues that the techniques should continue to play a valuable
role in War College student development and makes recommendations
for improving on their present use. Keywords: Army training,
[illegible handwritten text]
Personnel selection. [illegible]

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SENIOR LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
AT THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Do assessment center techniques 1 have a place in the U.S.
Army War College (USAWC) curriculum? If so, what is it?

This paper will argue that assessment center techniques have
been and can continue to play a valuable student development role
at the USAWC and that minor adjustments can improve the present
application. Specific recommendations and materials to use in
the curriculum are included.

ASSUMPTION

There is an underlying assumption which is shared among the
many professional proponents of the assessment center method. It
is that great leaders are made, not born. Or put another way,
leadership/management skills even at very senior, executive
levels can be improved by self-awareness and developmental
effort.

This is stated as an assumption because there seems to be
little or no empirical research to prove it. It is accepted
wisdom and certainly the philosophy underlying a great deal of
effort by the U.S. Army. In fact, much of the theory underlying
the USAWC rests on this assumption. But the validity of the
assumption seems to be called into question by actual practice in
U.S. business and military organizations, since the tendency

seems to be to replace executives with performance problems rather than to develop them.

The normal reaction of organizations to performance problems in executives and high-level managers is to transfer, demote, or fire. They may try to counter an executive's shortcomings by hiring associates with corresponding strengths, but usually the solution of choice is changing executives or "those around the executive--to use selection instead of development. Much less frequently do organizations attempt to create movement within the executive--that is, to encourage the executive's personal and managerial growth."[2]

Clearly, some executives are receptive to learning and changing and improving their leadership/managerial skills. Is this a hallmark of a successful executive who is still rising to his full potential?[3] The key question may really be "Can someone's full potential for successful executive performance be increased by developmental efforts?" This amounts to a variation on the "nature or nurture" question so common in many sociological issues. This paper will not answer the question, but will assume the answer to be positive.

There is a substantial body of research and academic writing on why executives/managers "derail"[4], on selecting managers and executives and on managerial development/training options. There is even a fair amount of research on whether entry- or lower-level managers improve their performance and long-term effectiveness as a result of developmental efforts and training.[5]

2

(A limited review shows this research to be inconclusive with mixed results, but generally it seems entry-level managers' performance does improve. This would be a fertile area for further study.6) But there is little or no empirical research to learn if executives/senior managers can still improve their potential and/or performance or if their leadership/managerial style is too fixed. Experience and "common sense" suggest there is value in developmental efforts like assessment centers for senior people if organizations are willing to commit the resources.

ASSESSMENT CENTERS - GENERAL BACKGROUND

An "assessment center" is the place or the process used to predict future job behavior by observing and evaluating performance in simulations of future job activities. It has been used by business, government and the military since World War II, most often targeting leadership and management skills. COL Roy Ray examined the subject in detail in a 1982 USAWC Individual Research Based Essay.7

It is most commonly used for purposes of selection. As a prediction of potential, the results are typically part of the criteria used for job selection or promotion decisions. Results have been found to be more reliable than traditional methods such as tests, interviews, supervisor evaluation and biodata. As a result, the method has been positively accepted by individual

3

participants, using organizations, most researchers, and by
courts judging the equality of employment opportunity.8

The other major use is for training and development.
Assessment centers identify specific needs of assessees so they
and their organizations can maximize remediation. The simulation
exercises themselves also have a training benefit for both the
participants and the assessors. Because of the cost, using
assessment center techniques solely for developmental purposes is
rare. Most users are organizations that employ assessment
centers for selection purposes, although many add developmental
or training activities as well.

Its popularity has prompted considerable research, writing,
and formation of professional groups and consulting businesses
specializing in the assessment center method.9

ASSESSMENT CENTERS IN THE ARMY

Records outlining the origin of assessment techniques at the
USAWC 10 reveal a climate of interest in the use of assessment
throughout the Army during the 1970's and early 80's. The U.S.
Army Research Institute was involved in most of this, including a
1973-74 U.S. Army Infantry School assessment center for students
in Infantry Officer Advanced and Basic Courses and Advanced NCO
Educational System courses run to determine its value in
leadership development and leadership prediction.11 Frederick N.
Dyer and Richard E. Hilligoss of the Army Research Institute

4

Field Unit at Fort Benning, Georgia, reported the experiment was seen as useful but costly.12

In May 1979 the general officers of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel reviewed Army assessment centers.14 They commented on the mid-70's Review of Education and Training for Officers study which recommended the use of assessment center techniques for development of brigadier general designees. The general officers also reviewed the use of assessment center methodology, including the Fort Benning study, USAWC's assessment program, Fort Carson's company pre-command course, the battalion and brigade pre-command course, and a pilot course for division and installation commanding generals. They also posed, for future consideration, questions involving developmental value, who the Army should assess, whether an in-house Army assessment center should be established, and how to "sell" the concept to the Army.

In 1980 the Army also conducted a Workshop on Performance-based Assessment Methodology.14 The workshop sought to collect and share information on all Army assessment efforts and to refine the assessment application being developed for the ROTC community. The result was a formal assessment center package exported to all ROTC detachments in 1982-83. It was implemented to give more predictive validity to the selection process for prospective ROTC cadets and scholarship applicants. It also prioritized cadets' leadership skills for development efforts.

In this atmosphere of interest and exploration of assessment center techniques, the USAWC began to expand its use of assessment. The next chapters will look at this use and suggest improvements.

ENDNOTES

1. Roy Ray, COL, Assessment Center Technology, pp. 1-15.

2. Robert E. Kaplan, Wilfred H. Drath and Joan R. Kofodimos, High Hurdles - The Challenge of Executive Self-Development, pp. 1-2.

3. Ibid., pp. 40-41.

4. Morgan W. McCall Jr. and Michael M. Lombardo, "What makes a top executive?", Psychology Today, February 1983, reprint by Center for Creative Leadership.

5. J.J. Turnage and P.M. Muchinsky, "A comparison of the predictive validity of assessment center evaluations versus traditional measures in forecasting supervisory job performance: interpretive implications of criterion distortion for the assessment paradigm," Journal of Applied Psychology, November 1984, pp. 595-602.

6. Barry M. Cohen, Joseph L. Moses and William C. Byham, The Validity of Assessment Centers: A Literature Review, pp. 23-26.

7. Ray, pp. 1-19.

8. Donald W. MacKinnon, An Overview of Assessment Centers, pp. 4-5.

9. William C. Byham, What Do We Know About Assessment Centers?, p. 1.

10. Papers on Assessment Center Techniques dated between 1973 and 1981 in the personal office files of Dr. Herbert F. Barber, USAWC, Carlisle.

11. U.S. Army Infantry School, Assessment Center After Action Report, p. 1.

12.   Frederick N. Dyer and Richard E. Hilligoss, Using an Assessment Center to Predict Leadership Course Performance of Army Officers and NCOs, paper presented at the 20th Annual Conference of the Military Testing Association, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 30 October - 3 November 1978.

13.   Walter F. Ulmer, Jr., LTG, Headquarters Department of the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, memorandum, subject: An Army Assessment Center, 23 May 1979.

14.   Report of the U.S. Army Workshop on Performance-based Assessment Methodology, Hampton, VA, 13-14 March 1980.

CHAPTER II

USAWC SENIOR LEADERSHIP ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Assessment center techniques are a part of the USAWC
curriculum now. They have been used in Academic Years 1984 and
1988 as part of an optional advanced course, Senior Leadership
Assessment and Development, and in the intervening three academic
years as a Complementary Program. Their use has evolved as part
of the effort to help students learn more about themselves and to
take corrective developmental action to improve their leadership
and management skills. This evolution occurred in the Army's
generally positive environment toward assessment center methods
partially described in the previous chapter.

The USAWC also investigated wider use of the techniques.
USAWC files contain a 27 August 1979 memorandum for the
Commandant, subject: Enhanced Student Assessment, recommending n
assessment center feasibility test for all resident students.[1]
Approval led to a contract with Development Dimensions
International (DDI) to identify critical skills for successful
performance as a colonel and brigadier general, to develop
exercises to enable assessment of behavior in these skill areas,
to use the exercises to develop a performance-based executive
skills assessment center for the USAWC, to train assessors, to
conduct a pilot assessment program and develop recommendations
for developmental activities, evaluate it and to then recommend
the best method to institute assessment procedures here.[2]

8

A 22 September 1981 Disposition Form reported the USAWC
Assessment Center status to the Commandant.3 In May 1981 DDI did
job analysis interviews with 29 colonels and generals and
identified 15 military executive skill areas related to
successful performance (see Appendix 1 4). Selected general
officers reviewed and approved them. DDI developed three
exercises, an "in-basket", a group discussion and negotiation
exercise, and a competitive group exercise.

Eight local retiree and twelve staff/faculty volunteers
received assessor training in November 1981. The pilot
assessment center was conducted and evaluated a few months later.
In November the status was again reported to the Commandant5, who
gave approval to assess all students in Academic Year 1983, and
to move to "establish a Leadership Assessment and Development
Center at Carlisle Barracks for the purpose of supporting
Army-wide needs."

The files do not show what happened after this point, so
follow-up interviews were conducted with two now-retired officers
involved, living in the Carlisle area - COL Paul F. Orr and COL
Charles A. Beitz, Jr. COL Orr indicated that the pilot center
was very well received and the process was viewed as very
worthwhile for student development.6 He said one of the strong
benefits was the improvement in faculty skills in evaluation and
in critiquing behavior. But further analysis determined the 100%
assessment to simply need too much assessor time for the payoff
it would give. Most of the faculty would have to be involved and

it probably would have had to be done before the academic year
began, adding at least two weeks to the year. Therefore the
group involved got the Commandant's approval to end the project;
the materials that had been developed would be used in an
optional advanced course if possible.

COL Beitz confirmed all this.7 He took over the program in
1983. After some experimentation, he adapted the DDI "in-basket"
and the group discussion and negotiation exercises (Chief of
Staff and National Executive Council exercises, respectively) to
largely be self-assessed for use in an Academic Year 1984
Advanced Course. The course also included curricular material to
teach students about the most troublesome leadership skill
dimensions assessed in the exercises. Then the two assessment
exercises were used alone as a Complementary Program in Academic
Years 1985 - 1987. An excellent description of the two exercises
and how they apply to assessing the senior Army leadership
dimensions found important by DDI's research is at Appendix 1.

This informal approach has support in the literature of
assessment. Frank and Struth point out the advantages of
self-assessment are lower cost and improved skills for
participants who learn and use assessor skills on themselves.8
There is lower validity from self-assessment, but the authors
argue that when the results are only being used for development
then objective validity is not necessary. Rather, to develop a
personal development plan one only needs a rank ordering of skill

areas with some sensing of the order of magnitude of their strength or weakness (very strong, medium, very weak).

Taking over the Senior Leadership Assessment and Development Program from COL Beitz, Dr. Herbert F. Barber opted to use the Advanced Course approach again in Academic Year 1988. Assessment techniques and leadership skill dimensions were explained and students did a pre-assessment self evaluation. Students then participated in a videotaped National Executive Council (N.E.C.) exercise (see Appendix 1). After a brief introduction to assessor skills, they assessed the videotaped performance of themselves and one other student in their subgroup of five or six. Besides their own self-assessment, each student received anonymous written evaluation from one peer and any oral feedback given in a subgroup discussion of their exercise. Next, the Chief of Staff in-basket was completed and self-assessed using the guide checklist developed by DDI (see description in Appendix 1). For both exercises students submitted "Participant Report Forms," reported their numeric dimension ratings, and did a critique reacting to each of the exercises. After completing both exercises they were asked to integrate their own scores and submit an overall skill dimension rating survey.

Besides these specific assessment center exercises the advanced course offered other diagnostic opportunities and provided developmental tools. The KAI test (Kirton Adaption-Innovation Inventory), Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II, and Center for Creative Leadership's Executive

11

Inventory were paper-and-pencil measures used to give further insight into leadership skills. A thorough bibliography was provided and a tour of the USAWC Library's Executive Skills Center was conducted. Lecture-seminars were conducted on stress and conflict management, consensus building and creative problem solving. Students were asked to complete a personal development plan and provide a copy along with their end-of-course critique.

ENDNOTES

1. Papers on Assessment Center Techniques dated between 1973 and 1981 in the personal office files of Dr. Herbert F. Barber, USAWC, Carlisle.

2 - 5. Ibid.

6. Interview with Paul F. Orr, COL (Ret.), Carlisle, 14 February 1988.

7. Interview with Charles A. Beitz, Jr., COL (Ret.), Carlisle, 14 February 1988.

8. Fredric D. Frank and Michael R. Struth, "The Self-Assessment Center," Training, March 1984, pp. 56-59.

CHAPTER III

MODIFICATIONS TO PRESENT USE OF N.E.C. EXERCISE

Assessment techniques' developmental role in the USAWC curriculum has been judged to be valuable by students. The student evaluations of prior years' assessment exercises show strongly positive results (so consistently positive that detailed analysis of four years' records was not worthwhile). They learned about themselves and how to improve, were favorable to the assessment exercises and to the advanced course, and would recommend it to others. This seems to be convincing evidence to support the continuation of use of modified assessment center techniques (mainly self-assessment, supplemented by written test instruments) at the USAWC for at least the purpose of identification of development needs.

So can the present Advanced Course be improved? To gain the opinions of Class of 1988 participants a questionnaire was used. It was sent out in late January 1988, about two months after the Advance Course ended. Of the 37 other students, 22 responded (59%). The questions, objective answers, and most cogent comments are in the tables in this and the next two chapters.

Students also gave reactions after completing each of the two assessment exercises. Many comments were similar, so have been edited and are presented in the following tables.

This chapter examines the data about the National Executive Council Exercise (N.E.C.) and suggests possible improvements. The next chapter does the same thing for the in-basket exercise.

Chapter VI then looks at data about the Advanced Course overall

and how it can be improved.

TABLE 1
Do you feel you benefitted from the National Executive Council (N.E.C.) group exercise and its evaluation? YES = 19 ; NO = 1 ; ? = 2 Please describe briefly in what way-s and the source of the insight-s.
- TV recording/media exposure experience - Sensitizing to dynamics of group process--seeing myself in a group - Group and individual feedback confirmed my self assessment - Reinforced need to be familiar with agenda items, organized, prepared and to have excellent emphatic (sic) and negotiating skills - Made me aware of those physical distracters (behavior - nonverbal) that I was simply shocked by my performance (sic) - Best part of course; allowed evaluation of competing strategies; see what works, measure others' ideas and resolve, evaluate own approach and speaking abilities - Gained insight into techniques to "gain the floor" and selling my point of view while compromising - Learned that compromise within the discussion is strengthened by including other peoples' goals and specifically addressing their concerns - Less than desirable; not realistic; majority of group keyed on making themselves look good rather than trying to conduct a meaningful exercise; many sought to dominate the discussion; I left frustrated, mad, and with a lot less respect for several classmates. (re. #2 -- Eliminate the competition to see who can get the most money. Make it a group oriented tasking.) - View my weaknesses and receive helpful criticism of my deficiencies

TABLE 2

Do you have any suggestions for improving that exercise?

YES = 12; NO = 10

- Leave it alone
- Add a facilitator or someone in charge
- A little more prep time in the classroom about the importance of consensus when working against time for a limited resource
- Peer evaluation not especially beneficial
- Better if reviewed and commented on by someone trained for it
- Would have welcomed a more critical analysis of performance
- Evaluate tape in joint session with an instructor
- Show another group's session
- Prior teaching on body language, interpersonal communication skills, negotiating skills, use of power, etc.
- Change table arrangement to a "V" so we can see each other
- Change seating arrangement so as not to favor the center
- Give presentation aid, e.g. chalkboard, butcher paper
- Need opportunity to know other group members beforehand
- Exclude IF's - their struggles with English burden others; IF general officer dominated and prevented normal behavior
- IF's did not fully understand intent and saw it as win/lose

TABLE 3

Did you get feedback from your small group critique of the exercise?   YES = 21 ; ? = 1
Written feedback from one other student?   YES = 21 ; ? = 1
Do you think any feedback you received was valid?
                                       YES = 18 ; NO = 1 ; ? = 2

- Don't feel individual totally honest with me; very little individual feedback in our small group critique; need faculty critique of individual/group performance
- Written feedback was totally invalid - possibly due to IF cultural differences
- I'm now more confident that I am articulate and can influence others
- Students tended to be kind; less critical
- Most was valid, albeit a little harsh
- Encouraging, as I was not pleased with my performance

TABLE 4

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE - REACTION TO THE N.E.C. EXERCISE
(FROM 34 RESPONDENTS RIGHT AFTER COMPLETING EXERCISE)

How effectively do the oral and written instructions communicate
what is required of participants?
5 (very effectively)...4...3...2...1 (very ineffectively)

AVERAGE = 4.1

How similar are the tasks required of participants during this
exercise to those performed by colonels in the Army?
5 (very similar)...4...3...2...1 (very dissimilar)

AVERAGE = 4.2

Relative to the complexity and difficulty of colonel positions,
this exercise is:
  (1) too difficult and complex
  (2) appropriate in its level of difficulty and complexity
  (3) too easy

AVERAGE = 2.0

The time allotted for completing this exercise is:
  (1) too great
  (2) sufficient
  (3) insufficient

AVERAGE = 2.1

To what extent does this exercise challenge participants' skills
and abilities in the areas of decisionmaking, leadership, and
communication?
5 (to a great extent)...4...3...2...1 (not at all)

AVERAGE = 4.0

To what extent does the exercise give participants the
opportunity to demonstrate skills and abilities in the above
areas?
5 (to a great extent)...4...3...2...1 (not at all)

AVERAGE = 4.1

How interesting was participation in this exercise?
5 (very interesting)...4...3...2...1 (very boring)

AVERAGE = 4.4

Describe any improvements needed in this exercise. [NOTE:
FREQUENCY IS STATED, THEN THE REPHRASED COMMENTS]
9 - Change table arrangement so participants can see each other
8 - Should have preparation time right before the exercise, not
    during the preceding week. (One opposing commenter liked
    getting the instructions well ahead.)
7 - International Fellow participation is a problem

16

```
| 7 - Need butcher paper or blackboard available                       |
| 6 - Need more student feedback on how different groups handled        |
|     problem; have small groups discuss with the whole class after     |
|     they discuss                                                      |
| 5 - Should get feedback from more assessors                           |
| 4 - Need feedback from a professional, the instructor or other        |
|     non-participant outsider                                          |
| 4 - Exercise good as it is                                            |
| 4 - Need better instructions about how sensitive the microphones      |
|     are and about the purpose of the TV (that students are not        |
|     speaking to an outside audience; administrative recording         |
|     medium only)                                                      |
| 2 - Need "standards/examples" - teaching on what is effective         |
|     performance                                                       |
| 2 - Part I Participant Report Form should be given to assessor        |
|     before writes up assessment so comments can be considered         |
| 1 - Should have a chance to meet others before taping begins          |
| 1 - Need more assessor training                                       |
```

The Senior Leadership Assessment and Development Advanced
Course in Fall 1987 began with an introduction to the course and
to the assessment center method and process. The general
background, purpose, research base and techniques were discussed.
Student experience with assessment techniques was explored and
found to be limited or none with the exception of one individual
who had been an assessor and center administrator for a
three-year ROTC tour. The first assessment center exercise of
the Advanced Course was previewed.

The National Executive Council competitive group exercise
was conducted over the first three weeks of the Advanced Course.
General scenario and specific role instructions were distributed
at the first class, 5-6 person small groups were designated, and
times in the following two weeks were assigned to each group. At
this specified time the group reported to the USAWC television
studio, received a brief instruction and conducted the one hour

exercise while being videotaped. This took the place of the
second week's class. During the third week's class meeting
instruction with practical exercises was given on behavior
capture, classification, analysis and use of report forms. Small
groups received their videotape, were given time to review it,
then conducted a leaderless small group discussion of the
exercise. Instructions were to discuss the general flow,
problems and success of the exercise and to critique each other's
performance. In the following week each participant completed
his/her own participant report form about personal preparation
and conduct of the exercise and reviewed the tape again,
capturing behavioral data on him/herself and one other student.
The data was classified, analyzed and an assessment report form
was written on the other student which was then given to him/her
anonymously.

The data displayed in Tables 1 and 4 above shows this
exercise to have been highly positive for participants. Almost
all believe it was of benefit and was very interesting. They
thought it gave opportunity to demonstrate and it challenged
their decisionmaking, leadership and communication skills. In
general, they were satisfied with the instructions and the
allotted time.

A very few individuals did not have a positive experience.
This was apparently due to a particular small group's overly
competitive approach to the exercise, the dominant role that an
International Fellow general officer sought to play, an

unsuccessful outcome, and feedback perceived as invalid because it critiqued behavior seen as unnatural due to the group makeup. The unfortunate conclusion that must be drawn is that there will be dissatisfied individuals from virtually any group activity and that there will inevitably be some "chemistries" that repel rather than merge. It can only be hoped that the individuals did add to their store of experience and in fact gain some value in dealing with negative situations, even if they don't realize it.

Many specific suggestions and comments were offered about the exercise. A number of them can be discounted as reflecting a lack of understanding and limited experience with the assessment center procedures, i.e., "give us prior teaching on ... negotiating and other skills." Several reflect the problem of assessment by minimally assessor-trained students, i.e., "students tended to be kind and less critical", or "most was valid, albeit a little harsh."

One comment that was not made was that the exercise needed more time. This surprised me, since the written instructions said one and one-half hours would be allowed, but Dr. Barber changed this to one hour. Some groups did not reach agreement and produce the written recommendation required, so I expected some desire for more time. The Reactions had an average response of 2.1, where 2 was "enough time" and 3 was "needs more time". Thus the great majority think one hour is enough. I tend to agree, based on my personal experience with my group. We did not discuss decision criteria or the process at all, but went right

19

into exchanging information about our projects. In other words, we focused on content, not process. We had no extra time and had to prod ourselves to move along, but we got done without great stress. We would not have had time in one hour to discuss the process before beginning to negotiate on content. In reviewing 14 tapes of some of the exercises from the last four years, I observed four groups that tried to decide on process before talking about content. None were able to reach agreement on their final recommended project list in the allotted one hour. I also suspect that groups of six (mine only had five) may have more trouble just because there is one more person who wants a share of the time. Incidentally, 75 minutes was given in Spring 1984, according to the old course syllabus on file.

RECOMMENDATION: At this point I recommend continuing to give one hour, but carefully watch groups of six to see if many are not finishing. If so, consider giving groups of six 75 rather than 60 minutes.

Some suggested improvements should be made, however. The most common critique was about the table arrangement, which was a very large angle "V" with two tables, almost straight, facing two videocameras. This made it very hard to focus on the other participants and almost forced a focus on the cameras, proving very distracting in a competitive negotiating session. In fact, at least one student had the misperception that the simulated situation had the group meeting being telecast live to the whole country, leading him to deliberately play to the supposed viewing

audience. The best arrangement for this type exercise, in my experience, is in a small circle of about eight foot diameter, sitting in student tablet-arm desks so there is a place to write, with assessors (or cameras) behind and out of the way. This allows participants to focus on each other, to observe nonverbal actions, and to really concentrate on the negotiation process. The USAWC television studio director believes he could arrange two cameras in his studio to record students sitting in a circle.

RECOMMENDATION: Participants should be seated facing each other in a circle in tablet arm individual desk-chairs with two cameras positioned behind them to each record half the group. The administrator's verbal instructions need to strongly reemphasize the academic/instructional purpose of the cameras and that the students are only being observed and reacting to each other in the group. The degree of microphone sensitivity also needs to either be explained or demonstrated so as to better reduce this distraction.

One artificiality of the exercise, not knowing the other participants' names and positions, can easily be solved, and also help clarify the videotape for anyone else who might watch it. Before the official time begins, as the ending element of the administrator's verbal instructions, the student participants should be required to introduce themselves and their ministerial positions. This should be recorded. It will help the technicians set their sound levels, will include a record of participants and positions on the tape (unlike the present

21

unreadable signs), and will "break the ice" and ensure that students at least know each others' names. They may not otherwise. In some groups, just figuring out the players and overcoming the reluctance to speak has presented some initial hurdles and considerable awkwardness.

RECOMMENDATION: After the administrator's instructions, participants should introduce themselves and their ministerial positions for recording on tape, but this should not be timed.

Many suggestions were received that a presentation aid was needed. A small easel with butcher paper, dry marker board, or chalk board would help the groups form proposed lists of projects that all could see. Providing one would give an opportunity to see how it would be used, although this could possibly reduce the opportunity for multiple participants to show initiative by keeping track of proposals themselves. It should not adversely affect the behavior in the exercise, based on my experience in which chalk boards were available in the regular classrooms used for assessment centers and were sometimes used. It may not be possible for prepositioned television cameras to pick up such an aid. If not, use of a camera operator may need to be considered, although this is disadvantageous because it could be distracting. Further, what is actually written on the presentation aid is probably not significant in terms of the behavior being captured, so does not need to be readable on the TV tape. The alternatives need to be carefully considered in any case.

RECOMMENDATION: A small portable presentation aid
(blackboard, dry marker board, or butcher paper) should be placed
in the room, available for use if someone exercises initiative to
do so, but not so conspicuous as to suggest its use is required
or expected. (Videotape acuity should not be considered critical
and therefore should not preclude this approach.)

International Fellow (I.F.) student participation is a
problem. They adversely affect behavior of the U.S. students,
making the exercise less valuable for them. This is particularly
true when they are general officers and expect to be in charge,
or when their poor language skills hamper communications, as was
true in two cases this year. It is also questionable whether
they benefit, either at all or as much as U.S. students. Both
the skill dimensions and exercises were developed for U.S. Army
officers and cultural differences at the least raise doubts about
exercise validity (and could be used as an excuse for I.F.
nonparticipation). None of this year's four foreign participants
completed a Reaction questionnaire for the N.E.C. exercise. Only
one identified himself on the overall post-course survey; he
indicated he gained from this exercise and from the course, but
not from the in-basket. This exercise is the only part of the
Advanced Course in which their participation may create problems.
It is probably "politically" inappropriate to prevent I.F.
students from taking the course. Instead, all I.F. students
could be grouped together for this exercise and be more carefully
instructed to ensure language handicaps are minimized and that

23

they understand the directions. A N.E.C. panel would probably not work with less than four participants, so if the I.F. students can't be grouped to make one or more groups of four to six, then they should individually and tactfully be invited just to observe an all-U.S. group with the instructor and should not participate in this exercise.

RECOMMENDATION: I.F. students should not be mixed in N.E.C. panels with U.S. students.

The second most common suggestion was that preparation time should immediately precede the videotaped exercise, not be spread over the preceding week. (One student did comment about liking this, however.) Other discussions with participants revealed that some had read instructions several days earlier and forgotten details and some had not read the instructions until very quickly just before (or during) the exercise. The strong conclusion is that there was a considerable variation in the quality and/or amount of preparation for the exercise. One of the critical elements in the assessment center process is the elimination of all possible variation so that true, valid performance skills will be exhibited for judgment. Differences in behavior must be judgeable as differences in strength, not preparation or background. Validity of the skill assessments from this exercise is already reduced by their source (self- and semi-trained student assessments); as much potential variation as possible needs to be eliminated. Therefore, preparation for the exercise needs to be done under supervision. Small groups should

report to a Seminar Room or small study room at designated times and only then receive their exercise instructions. They should have the stated one hour to prepare, then go to the television studio and immediately conduct the exercise. It would be better, in fact, to make this session four hours long and include the small group discussion right after the exercise, thus making a "least-cost" improvement in feedback as will be discussed in the next few paragraphs. But at minimum, preparation and exercise need to be done together.

RECOMMENDATION: Do N.E.C. preparation/instruction and the exercise in one two-hour block.

The next most common criticism involved feedback. In fact, taken all together, comments about feedback almost exceeded all others. Desired was more feedback, feedback from more assessors, better feedback, feedback from non-participating assessors - especially the instructor or other "professional", and/or feedback about how other groups handled the problem. One student recommended more assessor training.

Resource constraints seem to preclude major increases in the amount of assessment and feedback for this exercise. Even so, a full assessment center situation with independent senior people as assessors and giving integrated feedback would be desirable and would answer the need inferred from these student suggestions. This may be very difficult to implement. Having each student assess two others, so as to increase the amount of feedback, is a viable option, but students may object to the work

of assessing more than one other student. It might be worth
trying next year to judge the next Advanced Course's perception
of the cost/benefit level.

RECOMMENDATION: Experiment next year with having each
participant receive anonymous written feedback from two others.

Improving student feedback quality is almost impossible
without giving them full assessor training with its practical
exercises. I judge this would not be worthwhile, given the
developmental purpose of the course. As a previously fully
trained and experienced assessor, I thought the training this
year was quite adequate for its intended purpose and tend to
discount the student's suggestion that more assessor training is
needed (Table 4). But the instructor might consider this facet
and possibly try to be a little more careful in giving the
limited assessor training than was done this year.

RECOMMENDATION: Try to be even more sensitive to student
apprehensions and desire for "expert" feedback while doing
"assessor training."

I do think some response is possible and appropriate for the
other feedback suggestions on "professional"/outside assessors
and on learning how other groups did. The instructor obviously
cannot give full, formal assessments to all the students. But if
he would observe all the exercises as they occurred he could make
some very generalized notes about the individuals and group.
Then immediate feedback of a general nature could be given by
having the small group discussion right after the exercise, with

the instructor sitting in both as a moderator and to give

feedback to the whole group. (Any individual observations should

be given verbally to each person alone, or by note.) If handled

right, this should generate quite a bit more individual feedback

for each participant as well, which should be a goal of the

instructor/moderator.

This would also respond to another observation, that the

leaderless small groups did not fully explore their group and

individual experience and did not critique everyone. Some

perceived the group critique as something of a waste of time,

which it should not have been if fully developed and/or

controlled properly. The instructor should participate as an

independent observer, as one who has seen many groups, and as a

controller/moderator to ensure the group feedback session is

complete. It would be best to do this in the two hours right

after the taping session, to include viewing the tape, while

memories are fresh. In particular, instructive

discussion/comments could be made during the tape viewing about

verbal and nonverbal communications and negotiating techniques.

With instructor participation this could well be the most

worthwhile part of the whole course. As it is, a number of

students commented that seeing themselves on the tape was a first

opportunity that they universally found very valuable.

The first step in this post-taping group feedback session

should be to complete individual Participant Report Forms. The

instructor should collect these and then redistribute them to the

other group member being assigned as the assessor to do the anonymous written assessment. Assessors need the information on the Report Forms and it will help them if they know who they are assessing before the group discussion. Each student Report Form would then be returned with the written assessment.

RECOMMENDATION: Add two more hours to the preparation and exercise two-hour period recommended above (four total). The instructor observe and make general notes about the exercise, then right after the exercise is conducted and taped have Participant Report Forms completed. The instructor collect and redistribute these to the other participant who will do the written feedback. Then with the instructor moderating and giving general feedback too, the group should view the tape and discuss the exercise in general, with generalized group feedback to individuals. The instructor may start and stop the tape and use the opportunity for impromptu instruction on effective and ineffective behaviors exhibited by the small group; any specific critical feedback to individuals should be given in private orally or in writing.

The third class session could then still include the assessor instruction. But it should include viewing the instructional tape developed with this project (separately provided) to see how some other students have successfully handled the situation. This instructional tape could also be used as a practical exercise in data collection, classification and analysis to improve on this year's assessor training; also,

28

the accompanying Assessment Parts I and II could be reproduced
and distributed as another example of behavior capture and
classification. Each of the small groups should describe their
experience and the class should discuss "What is the ideal
solution?" to help explore the competitive group process. Some
limited instruction on group decision-making and/or negotiating
techniques might also be appropriate for this class. Time for
small groups to again view their tapes for data-gathering and the
individual detailed written assessments will have to be done
outside of class, although any extra time could be allotted for
this. One specific point that needs reinforcement during the
class is the reason the exercise is competitive (to see how
students will respond; if they will cooperate when not forced to
do so by the situation; how negotiation is needed) and how the
resulting behavior differs from cooperative group efforts. This
distinction and its implications proved troublesome for some
students who expressed strong negative reactions to the
competition in their group.

RECOMMENDATION: Focus the class period following the N.E.C.
exercise on more instruction and "seminar-type" discussion of the
leadership dimensions involved (be sure to deal with effects of
competitive group situations), including viewing an example tape
of a different group, as well as assessor training, possibly
slightly more extensive than this year's.

CHAPTER IV

MODIFICATIONS TO PRESENT USE OF IN-BASKET EXERCISE

Student response to this exercise was positive too (64% felt they benefitted and 4.0 was the average rating for how interesting it was), but not to the same degree as to the N.E.C. exercise (83% and 4.4). The overwhelming majority of suggestions and complaints had to do with its length, complexity, and time required to complete it. Typical is one student's comment to the effect that there are benefits from the exercise and its evaluation, but they were not worth the effort.

The difficulties of accurate self-assessment particularly contributed to this reaction. The assessor in many steps is asked to make judgments comparing the participant's (his/her own) performance to that of the successful colonel. However, this is a position that the participant-assessor is aspiring to reach but of which he/she as yet has only a subordinate's limited view, so the comparison is at best of limited value. This is particularly the case for the in-basket, since the participant/assessor cannot compare his performance with that of anyone else, as occurs during the N.E.C. group exercise. Another example is that to evaluate written communication the assessor is asked to read at least five memos and critique them for grammar, spelling, clarity, etc. This is a virtually impossible task for the same person who wrote them.

It seems to me that self-assessment has a major flaw, supported by the Tables below. It runs counter to the personal

psychology of someone needing to improve performance. The first step is to learn shortcomings and where improvement is needed. But since we all make mistakes and we all are our own worst critics, many people may not understand how strong or weak they may be in particular abilities relative to peers or competitors for similar positions. This natural inability to compare oneself accurately to others can and often does lead to inappropriate complacency or, conversely, to inappropriately low self-esteem and confidence. In my experience as an assessor and/or administrator for some eleven ROTC assessment centers, their greatest value to the individual was in the objectivity of someone else's feedback comparing their performance to others' in the same situation. This was true particularly when the assessor was a senior person who had already advanced through the target level situation. People who put the effort into an evaluation of their performance want an objective report on how they stack up that is not afforded by more self-evaluation such as we all tend to do all the time. Thus self-assessment of the in-basket has real problems that reduce its value—its evaluation depends on the comparison by the participant of some elements of his performance with that of an group unknown to his personal experience, it allows him to consider his own intentions rather than overt observed performance, and it lacks the outsider who can either bolster unnecessarily sagging ego or motivate necessary corrective action. Even so, the exercise has value in the participants' opinion, as these tables show.

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                          TABLE 5                                 │
│                                                                   │
│ Do you feel you benefitted from the Chief of Staff in-basket      │
│ exercise?                                  YES = 14 ; NO = 8       │
│ Please describe how.                                              │
├─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┤
│                                                                   │
│    - Gained insights into "taking charge", but artificial since   │
│ decisions required early on that would have been postponed;       │
│ presupposed familiarity with civil-military environment           │
│    - Sensitized to type problems I may face later                 │
│    - Situations certainly plausible                               │
│    - Actions at a higher level than I've experienced              │
│    - Accurate representation of typical O-6 problems; isolated my  │
│ weaknesses                                                        │
│    - Excellent ideas on how to tie in several events, agencies to │
│ improve outcome                                                   │
│    - Problem solving "test" with many lessons; had to keep asking │
│ about many variables--long vs. short term, morale, priorities,    │
│ delegation vs. centralization, guidance vs. direction, flow of    │
│ info                                                              │
│    - Benefits but not worth effort; pleased with depth of my      │
│ understanding from thinking through problems and solutions        │
│    - Very artificial; "school solutions" often ridiculous--not    │
│ from Army I've been in                                            │
│    - Could evaluate my own thought processes plus think about what│
│ else I should have done after reading the school solution         │
│    - Most benefit was from discussion with my subgroup members    │
│ about how each tackled the exercise                               │
│    - Unreasonable.  Too long                                      │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                          TABLE 6                                 │
│                                                                   │
│ Did you complete its evaluation?     YES = 21 ; NO = 1            │
│ Did this help you?                   YES = 14 ; NO = 4 ; ? = 4    │
│ Do you agree with the outcome?       YES = 14 ; NO = 4 ; ? = 4    │
├─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┤
│                                                                   │
│    - Not entirely agree - lowest score in judgment, but           │
│ insufficient time to mull over alternative courses of action or   │
│ consult with staff before decision                                │
│    - Point/evaluation system so soft it's easy to see a distorted │
│ picture; my weak areas high and some strong areas looked weak     │
│    - Evaluation supported what I believed to be my shortcomings;  │
│ some responses...I did not think of                               │
│    - Tendency to respond quickly; evaluation did indicate valid   │
│ shortcomings                                                      │
│    - Helped as mental concentration exercise; only completed 25 of│
│ 31 items; do not agree with outcome                               │
│    - Helpful in analyzing or taking different view of a problem   │
│    - Mired in computations--too time consuming                    │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

- Outcome strongly influenced by time constraints
- Disagreed with some individual solutions, but overall evaluation was good and valid
- Helpful
- Substantiated what I already knew

TABLE 7
Do you have any suggestions for improving that exercise? YES = 13 ; NO = 9
- Cut out about 6 items; define meaning of "written response" - Do not write out responses - merely note actions - Include some means of communicating with your office - Give more time to review analysis within small groups - Remove time constraint so exercise can be conducted in more normal environment - "Solutions" should consider option of no action now - Organizational mix of military and civilian is good; some individual troop leading issues could be pared out - Structure was hard to follow and time consuming - Delete; have more teaching didactically or by guest lecturers on topics of interest/necessity to leaders (like that on power) - Provide more in class time or reduce the number of actions; more trading of ideas or solutions would be helpful - Get rid of it - Decrease number of problems - much too long - Eliminate or reduce the scale of the exercise - Abbreviate; too long & evaluation too muddled to be of value - Work openly as a group

TABLE 8
PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE - REACTION TO THE CHIEF OF STAFF EXERCISE (FROM 32 RESPONDENTS RIGHT AFTER COMPLETING EXERCISE)
How effectively do the oral and written instructions communicate what is required of participants? 5 (very effectively)...4...3...2...1 (very ineffectively) AVERAGE = 3.2
How similar are the tasks required of participants during this exercise to those performed by colonels in the Army? 5 (very similar)...4...3...2...1 (very dissimilar) AVERAGE = 3.9

Relative to the complexity and difficulty of colonel positions,
this exercise is:
   (1)   too difficult and complex
   (2)   appropriate in its level of difficulty and complexity
   (3)   too easy

                                          AVERAGE = 1.8

The time allotted for completing this exercise is:
   (1)   too great
   (2)   sufficient
   (3)   insufficient

                                          AVERAGE = 2.6

To what extent does this exercise challenge participants' skills
and abilities in the areas of decisionmaking, management, and
leadership?
5 (to a great degree)...4...3...2...1 (not at all)

                                          AVERAGE = 4.0

To what extent does the exercise give participants the
opportunity to demonstrate skills and abilities in the above
areas?
5 (to a great extent)...4...3...2...1 (not at all)

                                          AVERAGE = 3.8

How interesting was participation in this exercise?
5 (very interesting)...4...3...2...1 (not at all)

                                          AVERAGE = 4.0

Describe any improvements needed in this exercise. [NOTE:
FREQUENCY IS STATED, THEN THE REPHRASED COMMENTS]

10- Instructions not clear, especially for assessment, and
     especially regarding how much/little to write about each item
9 - Not enough time
8 - Evaluation (assessment) too tedious and boring
7 - Too long, too many items
7 - Reduce isolation, i.e., need access to phone, staff, computer
     interaction, etc.
4 - Need class discussion of "solutions"
2 - Need some sort of standard "memo" forms
2 - Delete or change evaluation of Written Communication skill
2 - Change the "unrealistic" situation
2 - Need overall list of organization's problems in evaluation
2 - Need matrix showing interrelationships in evaluation phase
2 - Doubt solutions' validity/completeness
1 - Should have to submit your draft schedule for analysis
1 - Should assess sooner after complete the exercise
1 - Solutions themselves are valuable

The most common comments dealt with the complexity and length of the exercise. The entire six hours is certainly necessary to do even a marginally adequate job with all the requirements for even the most skilled participant. The evaluation would take at least that long if done completely. For the "fuzzy" validity of the outcome this seems excessive.

Several students recommended deleting some of the items. That might well be possible, but the degree of relatedness between them makes it difficult to identify which Item numbers would be candidates. Analysis of the In-basket Manual and Report Forms Parts I and III shows a range of possible relationships from five to 27 items, e.g. relationships with five other Items may be discer ed for Item 4, the one item with the least number of relationships to other items. Half of the items are related to 13 or more others, with one item being related to 26 others. This analysis shows such a complex set of relationships that eliminating items may have a serious negative impact on the evaluation of in-basket performance.

RECOMMENDATION: Because of the complex relationships, eliminating any In-basket Items should not be attempted without the services of experts in assessment exercise design such as those at DDI who originally designed the present USAWC exercise.

Student frustration with the required effort was also shown by the large number of suggestions that isolation be reduced by allowing access to telephone, staff, computer interaction, etc. These comments simply reflect the normal desire for more

information about complex situations and to be able to reduce
workload by verbally passing off requirements. They do not
reflect a realistic appreciation for the nuances of the
assessment center method and for the need to gather data for
later evaluation. These suggestions should therefore be ignored.
It might help understanding to emphasize even more the reasons
for written communication only when issuing the materials.

RECOMMENDATION: Verbal instructions for the In-basket
should strongly emphasize the reason that communication is
limited to the written mode (enhances assessment simulation
standardization and permits data capture).

The other most common suggestion/complaint was that
instructions were not clear, particularly about how much or
little to write about each item. It is not desirable to
constrain students by telling them anything about this more than
they receive in the instructions. Analyzing the situation and
deciding how to accomplish this complex and demanding task is
precisely part of what is being evaluated and where the stress
that induces real, normal behavior comes from.

RECOMMENDATION: Do not verbally amplify on the instructions
about how much or little to write.

But one other suggestion may help with the underlying
student discomfort involved in these last three
complaints/suggestions. That was to provide some sort of
standard memo forms. The original envelope exercise packets from
DDI contain such an exercise aid, similar to the ones also

provided to participants in the ROTC assessment centers of my experience. Providing these gives a subtle hint of the type of informal, abbreviated, bullet-type correspondence that is most common and is pretty much required if all Items are going to be handled reasonably well. This can only help with the time management problem, hint at how much/little to write, and reinforce the restriction to written communication.

RECOMMENDATION: I strongly recommend the DDI original memo forms be reproduced on similar yellow paper and be provided in quantity to all students as part of their In-basket materials.

Another suggestion was to delete or change the evaluation of the Written Communication dimension. This seems a valid criticism. Being able to identify problems with your own writing requires that you know how to do it correctly, in which case you would. At best no more than a vague awareness that problems may exist could come from this evaluation. If so, that awareness would not be anything new. Also, the evaluation materials contain no objective way to rate the writing quality, rather requiring their comparison to that of a successful colonel (which the student cannot be familiar with). This part of the assessment seems to be without value. Instructions for evaluating Written Communications in the in-basket should be carefully reviewed. This dimension should probably not be evaluated at all. If it is, students should be told merely to do a quick review of their written responses to get a sense whether they communicated reasonably adequately, but they should be told

not to attempt to assess this dimension as the written directions (Parts I & II) require.

RECOMMENDATION: Tell participants not to evaluate Written Communication as the written instructions tell them to do, rather, at most do a quick review for clarity.

Another suggestion involved the need for a matrix showing relationships in the evaluation phase. Since these exist in the front of the In-basket Manual and in Parts I - IV of the assessment forms it seems the students did not understand the instructions. This suspicion is reinforced by inference from several other written comments and by discussions during the course. I missed the class period when they were given, so I cannot comment personally. It seems that some more careful instructions and possibly working through analysis of one or two In-basket Items in class may be needed to help students minimize the difficulty of the assessment. They should also be encouraged to promptly complete the assessment while instructions are fresh.

RECOMMENDATION: If the In-basket is done, instructions for prompt evaluation need to be given carefully, probably with some practical exercising.

I do think that students should at least read through the entire solution set and assessment forms and think about their actions, even if they don't do the formal written assessment. I suspect this is what many of them did anyway. In fact, given the questionable value of the self-assessment of this exercise, just reading the solution may be a reasonable alternative to offer to

students. However, analysis of the data above, if responses can be accepted as valid, suggests this alternative would cause some students to miss some worthwhile insights into their performance. I cannot recommend skipping the formal evaluation, therefore, but do suggest the instructor not be very insistent about demanding that students do the formal assessment of the in-basket.

One final suggestion was that the "solutions" should be discussed in class. If a discussion of the in-basket can be worked into the schedule it could be worthwhile. However, due to the length and complexity of the in-basket this discussion could really get bogged down in controversy and so should be handled cautiously if at all, even though it could have some value. It may be that what is really wanted/needed is instruction and discussion on how to succeed or improve in the measured dimensions. This issue is discussed in the section below.

RECOMMENDATION: Consider how to evaluate the in-basket and how to handle discussing the "solutions" in class.

CHAPTER V

MODIFICATIONS TO PRESENT ADVANCED COURSE OVERALL

The Advanced Course was a success as presented judging by
student feedback. The official student USAWC Scantron course
critique gave the course generally average marks compared to all
other Fall Advanced Courses. Workload was rated heavier than all
others (3.18 course mean with 1 being light and 5 being heavy),
but not significantly or to a level apparently judged
unreasonable. Other ratings showed a small degree of desire for
more in-class discussion (3.36 mean with 1 being much less and 5
being much more), that the pace was about right (2.97 mean with 1
much too slow and 5 much too fast), and slightly more reading
could be assigned (3.15 mean with 1 much less and 5 much more).
Other ratings showed mean course judgments of quantity to be
about right and quality to be between fair and good for
contribution to professional development, increase in knowledge
and skills, support for career development, preparation for
future assignments, achieving course objectives, and
effectiveness of guest lecturers. Again, except for workload,
all ratings were well "in the pack" of similar ratings for other
Advanced Courses.

These "official" ratings are reinforced by the "unofficial"
survey taken in conjunction with this paper. As Tables 10 and 11
show, all respondents (22 of 37 who took the course) reported
they gained insights into leadership behaviors they need to
improve, and 87% (19 of 22) increased their awareness of these

during the course. Most (20 of 22, or 90%) finished the course

with ideas about how to improve. Many (16 of 22, or 73%)

completed a personal Development Plan.

TABLE 10
Overall, did the Advanced Course give you insights into dimensions of your leadership behavior that you need to improve? YES = 22 Were you aware of these before the course to the same degree as after it? YES = 3 ; NO = 19

- Refined my self-awareness; I need to follow-up by reading in suggested bibliography. Perhaps the course should require a developmental activity related to a weakness and then a point paper about it.
  - Overall benefit; learned shortcomings I did not know I had
  - Was aware of shortcomings, but the course highlighted some and showed others to be not so serious; enjoyed course
  - No new insights, did confirm overall opinion of my leadership
  - Video was helpful
  - CCL marked my self scores very high in areas that surfaced as weak from the in-basket, but those areas have always been strengths, so it appears that my self scores from the in-basket skewed the results and gave a false reading
  - Some new insights and reinforced some old ones; heightened my awareness
  - Gave insights on what I need to improve; clarified deficiencies
  - Greatly improved; didn't like doing self critiques but have gotten better
  - If had known course would be only measurement instruments without teaching on leadership skills, I would not have taken it
  - Was aware of weaknesses, but learned they are not as detrimental to my performance as I had thought
  - Exercises with outside feedback most helpful, i.e., sending back for evaluations from my old job
  - Disappointed in course overall; expected more than programmed text approach to teaching; expected more instruction
  - Appreciated library tour; did not complete personal development plan, but have read library materials
  - Best part was CCL evaluation by subordinates, etc.--do early

TABLE 11
Did you complete the Advanced Course with ideas about how to improve in these dimensions?   YES = 20 ; NO = 2 Did you complete a personal Development Plan?   YES = 16; NO = 5; ? = 1

- More aware of areas I need to develop; know myself better
   - Have ideas about improvement and did a development plan that was rather poorly conceived; course may need to emphasize that more; maybe put library tour at beginning so can work in problem areas during course
   - Needs macro framework and everything related to it as course progresses
   - Plan alive and well; worked on delivery during Courses 3 & 4; volunteered to give several presentations
   - Plan to read the library books on negotiating skills - a weakness I was aware of before; got a good list of resources
   - Thought course would give ideas to improve weaknesses already knew; after 20 years most of us know them; revamp course; forget exercises
   - Enjoyed course, guest speaker and film in one of last classes
   - Recommend looking into a civilian course called Personnel Management for Executives for additional insights into management
   - Course was a big disappointment

This evidence supports a judgment that the course at least partly fulfilled its published objectives. The Academic Year 1988 USAWC Advanced Courses Program Directive states the objectives to be "To provide each student with an assessment of selected senior leadership and managerial skills and to enhance competence in selected skill areas." The course content and student feedback shows the students clearly did gain an assessment of their skills, most to a greater degree than before.

The success of the other element of the course objectives, "enhanced competence in selected skill areas," is less clear. Of the nine class meetings, six were devoted to the course introduction, paper and pencil measurement tests, and introduction, conduct, and evaluation of the two assessment

exercises. Other instruction included a discussion of the developmental tools and tour of the USAWC Executive Skills Center, a guest lecturer on power theory and consensus building, and lectures with handout reading materials on performance problems of executives, stress and conflict management.

At least some students expected more course content on improving skills and less on the assessment component. Several specific comments, reported in the Tables above, expressed strong disappointment in the course and a desire for more instruction and developmental activity to improve on weaknesses. This seems to be a valid criticism in light of the published objectives. One alternative response may be to leave the course alone and rewrite the objectives so students will have a more accurate expectation of the course. The objective might be rewritten "To provide each student with more in-depth assessment of their leadership and managerial skills, to assist them in preparing a personal development plan, and to expose them to theory and self-help development tools for selected leadership and managerial skills." The Scope description should also then be changed in the second paragraph to read "...course will then help each student focus on preparing a personal development plan and identifying available self-help resources to improve performance...".

RECOMMENDATION: Consider rewriting Course Objectives, possibly as suggested above.

At least three other alternatives exist for responding to the criticism that the course needs more emphasis on developmental activities. One is to adjust the current course content somewhat. Or it could be expanded into two advanced courses, with one focused on diagnostics and the other on corrective action, offered in the Fall and the Spring Terms, respectively. A third possibility would be to do some diagnostics and some development in each of two Advanced Courses.

Course content could be adjusted easily, because the present course commits class time to compensate for the time outside of class required for the exercises. Most of the class periods are devoted to little more than introductions of the exercises and their assessment. The instructor could accept the probably inevitable student complaints about too much work and not commit the class compensatory time, rather using it for developmental subjects. The Academic Year 1984 Advanced Course Syllabus (Appendix 2) has what appears to be an excellent application of this approach. Its ten-meeting course sequence is Introduction, In-basket, N.E.C. and Evaluation, Time Management, Negotiation Skills, Decisionmaking, Creative Problem Solving, Managing Groups, Communication Skills, and Organizational Context and Summary. This alternative has major advantages. It includes solid content on the most frequently problematic developmental subjects. It puts the assessment and evaluation component right up front, challenging students to do the exercises and their assessment outside of class time in one week each, allowing more

44

rapid feedback. (But if individual students have time constraints two-thirds of the course remains and could be used to complete the evaluation process later.) It gets both assessment and development packed into one course while student interest remains high from the Course 1 Self Assessment process. It gives the rest of the USAWC year to continue individual development efforts planned and/or begun during the course. It seems to have two disadvantages. The demands on the instructor to provide high quality, preferably performance-oriented content instruction will be considerably magnified. And the total demand on students from outside-of-class requirements will be considerably increased, both from the assessment exercises and from anticipated readings or exercises to support the later developmental instruction. Despite these significant disadvantages, this seems t_ be the best alternative.

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt the Advanced Course content of the 1984 Syllabus.

If this recommendation is not accepted, the second alternative is to split the one into two courses, with the Fall Term being focused on diagnostics and assessment and the Spring Term focusing on development. The diagnostic course could use even more class time for the assessment exercises, especially for exploration of results and approaches with seminar discussions. It could also include even more of the many available written test instruments and discussion and analysis of results. Hopefully it could include some method of integrating all of the

45

results from the total assessment process both of Course 1 and of the Advanced Course, resulting in preparation of more complete and carefully considered development plans. The Spring Term course should include all of the developmental topics in the AY 84 Syllabus with the other two class periods being used for more in-depth treatment of some, including practical exercises, and for inclusion of a class on power and consensus building such as we had this year. This approach should have a more reasonable workload for students than the previous alternative, but may not have enough content in the Fall Term course. It also would have a development plan prepared in the Fall Term so improvement efforts could be made the rest of the year. The major disadvantage, which I believe to be overwhelming, is that the Spring Term course would be competing with a plethora of other offerings and with student mental focus on preparing for specific assignments. It is unlikely many would be interested in the leadership development subjects at this point in the year, so even students interested enough to take the Fall Term course would miss the opportunity for whatever development efforts could be packed into a single course. This seems the least desirable alternative from the practical standpoint of generating student interest to take it.

The third alternative is a compromise between the other two. The N.E.C. exercise is the only one of the two that measures oral communication skills, negotiation, and interpersonal sensitivity. Only the In-basket measures written communication (albeit

poorly), individual leadership, time management, delegation, and
management control. Both exercises have some opportunity to
measure group leadership, planning and organizing, analysis,
initiative, judgment, and organizational sensitivity (although
the last three are primarily observed in the In-basket). Two
Advanced Courses could be designed using the same instructional
blocks as in the preceding alternative, but rearranging them to
group together one assessment exercise and the instruction on the
skills measured primarily in that exercise. These would then be
offered in the Fall and Spring Terms separately. This
alternative, like most compromises, also has mixed advantages.
It reduces workload in each of the two courses. Since it
combines both assessment and development in specific skill areas,
it could allow students to pick either grouping depending on
their own prior judgment about their own needs. This could make
both offerings less attractive individually, but more attractive
in sum. However, it still has the major disadvantage of
spreading development, and now assessment as well, into the
Spring Term when I suspect student interest will be substantially
lower. It also has two new disadvantages. Little of the
academic year remains for self-help development effort on needs
identified in the Spring Term. Also, student self-perceptions on
the basis of which they may choose to take only one of the two
Advanced Courses may be inaccurate, causing those interested
enough to try to find where they need to improve to be
misdirected. This is the second best alternative.

In any case, the assessor skills learned and applied should be of future value to students in improving behavior/performance observation and evaluation of other people. This benefit of the Advanced Course should be emphasized more in class to ensure students realize that it is a specific developmental skill they are learning from the Course.

RECOMMENDATION: Give more emphasis to the developmental value of learning assessor skills.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

1. More research is needed into whether executives/senior managers can still improve their potential and/or performance or if their behavior is too fixed.

2. Assessment Center techniques have great potential value to the Army both in identifying high potential leaders and in evaluating leadership skill levels for developmental purposes.

3. Assessment Centers are expensive to operate and have tended to receive limited use in the Army; the USAWC Center designed in 1979-82 has not been implemented for this reason.

4. Self-assessment is less accurate but cheaper than a formal Assessment Center evaluation, so has value in some cases. Self-assessment does have major drawbacks, however, in that the basis for comparison of performance is outside the experience of the participant/self-assessor. This is most troublesome in the In-basket. Even so, USAWC use of two assessment exercises in a mainly self-assessment mode has been affordable and valuable to students.

5. The present Senior Leadership Assessment and Development Advanced Course using modified assessment techniques is valuable and fulfilled its objectives, especially in assessing skills.

49

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Conduct research of former USAWC students who took this Advanced Course to learn if the results have been helpful and how they might be improved.

2. Further explore the field and attempt to get civilian academicians and researchers to investigate fully and objectively whether executives/senior managers can develop their skills further and whether improvement does actually occur after their assessment center participation.

3. USAWC should reconsider use of a full, formal Assessment Center for selection purposes. For example, one could be used to assess active duty Army officers to determine which ones should be enrolled in the "joint education track" to begin next year.

4. The following modifications in the N.E.C. exercise should be considered:

- Possibly give the exercise 75 minutes.

- Have participants sit in a circle.

- Clarify purpose of the TV cameras and microphone sensitivity.

- Introduce names and positions on videotape before start.

- Make a presentation aid available, e.g. butcher paper.

- Put International Fellows into their own separate group.

- Give each sub-group four hours to prepare, exercise, do
  Participant Report Forms then instructor give to assessors,
  view taped exercise, critique with instructor moderating;
  instructor give limited private individual feedback.

- Possibly have each student assess two others.

- Possibly train assessors somewhat more extensively.

- Use instructional tape as a focus for more full in-class discussion of the exercise.

    5.   Consider the following In-basket Exercise modifications:

- In instructions emphasize reasons for written communications only.

- Clarify evaluation instructions, especially for the Written Communications skill - which should be minimized.

- Provide memo forms.

- Discuss "solutions" in class; orient the exercise on development - learning from the exercise - minimizing the evaluation and rating aspect that is troubled by the questionable validity of self-assessment.

    6.   The Advanced Course overall was a success but could be improved by reinforcing the developmental component. The present one-term format should be modified to follow the pattern of developmental activities in the Academic Year 1984 Syllabus (Appendix 2). Consider rewriting the Course Objectives depending on other changes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1.   Beitz, Charles A., Jr., COL (Retired). Personal
Interview. Carlisle: 14 February 1988.

2.   Byham, William C.. What Do We Know About Assessment
Centers? The Assessment Center Research Group Preliminary
Report. Pittsburgh: Development Dimensions International Press,
1981.

3.   Cohen, Barry M., Moses, Joseph L., and Byham, William
C. The Validity of Assessment Centers: A Literature Review.
Pittsburgh: Development Dimensions International Press, 1977.

4.   Dyer, Frederick N. and Hilligoss, Richard E. Using an
Assessment Center to Predict Leadership Course Performance of
Army Officers and NCOs. Paper presented at the 20th Annual
Conference of the Military Testing Association, Oklahoma City,
Oklahoma, 30 Oct - 3 Nov 78.

5.   Frank, Fredric D., and Struth, Michael R.   "The
Self-Assessment Center." Training, March 1984, pp. 56-59.

6.   Kaplan, Robert E., Drath, Wilfred H., and Kofodimos,
Joan R. High Hurdles - The Challenge of Executive
Self-Development. Technical Report No. 25. Greensboro, NC:
Center for Creative Leadership, 1985.

7. McCall, Morgan W., Jr. and Lombardo, Michael M.   "What
makes a top executive?" Psychology Today, February 1983, reprint
by Center for Creative Leadership.

8.   MacKinnon, Donald W. An Overview of Assessment
Centers. Technical Report No. 1. Greensboro, NC: Center for
Creative Leadership, May 1975.

9.   Orr, Paul F., COL (Retired). Personal Interview.
Carlisle: 14 February 1988.

10.   Orr, Paul F., COL. USAWC Director of Faculty/Staff
Development. Memorandum for the Record, subject: USAWC
Assessment Program, 20 November 1981.

11.   Papers on Assessment Center Techniques. Personal
office files of Dr. Herbert F. Barber, U.S. Army War College,
Carlisle. Dated between 1973 and 1981.

12.   Ray, Roy, COL. Assessment Center Technology. Student
Essay. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 19 April 1982.

13.   Report of the U.S. Army Workshop on Performance-based
Assessment Methodology,   Hampton, VA, 13-14 March 1980.

14.   Turnage, J.J., and Muchinsky, P.M.   "A comparison of
the predictive validity of assessment center evaluations versus
traditional measures in forecasting supervisory job performance:
interpretive implications of criterion distortion for the
assessment paradigm." Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 69,
November 1984, pp. 595-602.

15.   Ulmer, Walter F., Jr., LTG.   Headquarters Department of
the Army, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.
Memorandum, subject: An Army Assessment Center, 23 May 1979.

16.   U.S. Army Infantry School.   Assessment Center After
Action Report.   Fort Benning: 31 Dec 74.

APPENDIX 1

THE ASSESSMENT CENTER EXERCISES

Two of the four assessment center exercises developed or selected for this use in the AWC Assessment Center are used in this advanced course. The job analysis results were used to design one exercise. They were developed from June to November, 1981, by Dr. Charles J. Cosentino under the supervision of Mr. Robert W. Rogers and Dr. William C. Byjam. One exercise that was previously developed for executives in the federal government was selected for use in the AWC Assessment Center. Based upon the job analysis results, this exercise was considered especially relevant to colonel/brigadier general positions.

The two exercises are described below:

The Chief of Staff In-Basket and Analysis Exercise

In this exercise, the participant is a newly-appointed chief of staff and headquarters troop commander of a fictitious U.S. Army Research and Evaluation Command commanded by a major general. The participants must respond to 31 memos and letters addressed to them or to their predecessor. The participants must also write a report which describes the command's underlying problems and recommends solutions. This exercise takes six hours to complete. The exercise materials for the In-Basket component include:

- the instructions

- the thirty-one in-basket items

- the Participant Report Form

- Classification by Dimension of Behavior Exhibited during the In-Basket exercise

- Self-Assessment Report Form--Parts I and II

- In-Basket Manual

The Exercise materials for the Analysis Component include:

- Classification by Dimension of Behavior Exhibited in the Analysis Component

- Self-Assessment Report Form--Parts III and IV

Other Exercise materials include:

- Self-Assessment Report Development Plan--Parts V and VI

- Participant Questionnaire--Reaction to the Chief of Staff Exercise.

54

The U.S. Army Research and Evaluation Command was devised to maintain combat-ready units and serve an R&D function in order to capture the "two worlds" in which job analysis interviewees operate. The developer was more concerned that the problems involve important aspects of those two worlds than whether an individual in a specific chief of staff position in reality would encounter the variety of problems contained in the in-basket. In all cases, job analysis interviewees encountered situations of a similar structure or type. Some items simulate important aspects of leading and managing troop units. Others simulate dealing with the public and managing civilians who support the Army's mission. Still others concern managing the critical interface between the military and civilians. The command's combat-ready status appropriately orients participants to consider the impact of this interface on readiness--the Army's primary mission. The command's R&D support function orients the participant to adopting an Army-wide perspective, making the assessment of the dimension, Organizational Sensitivity, possible.

Decisionmaking in the in-basket does not demand functional expertise. If it did, measures of dimensions would be contaminated. For example, if engineering and infantry expertise were needed, officers with those backgrounds who possessed the same level of proficiency in dimensional areas. There are real disadvantages if exercises are made too similar to real jobs. The setting does not involve combat. However, it is believed that an argument could be made that the dimensions play a critical role in combat effectiveness.

Dealing with the public as well as managing civilians and the relationships between them and the military may seem to receive a disproportionate emphasis, given the importance of leading combat units. It is proposed that the average participant will have more experience, more feedback, and more set viewpoints about managing/leading military personnel. While not neglecting this area, assessment center feedback on his/her ability to handle other matters will be less redundant, more useful, and more frequently the basis for re-evaluation and change. Moreover, it is likely that in peacetime, progressively more future assignments will involve these matters.

It was decided to place the participant in a position of authority rather than an advisory position for the following reasons: (a) job interviewees tend to view decisionmaking in the former position as more important--the results of the Dimension Selection Questionnaire support this conclusion; (b) most advisory staff positions give individuals the authority to direct a work unit; (c) placing the participant in a position of authority makes it easier to assess managerial dimensions. Advising the commanding general during the presentation part of this exercise attempts to simulate decisionmaking in an advisory role. Participants are placed in advisory positions during the other exercises.

The written analysis required in this exercise gives the participant the opportunity to reflect upon the causes of problems, think strategically about improvements, and develop a systematic plan of

action involving major interventions such as new policies, programs, management systems, procedures, and practices. The job analysis interviewees, especially major generals, emphasized the importance of this type of action at higher levels.

Participants have two opportunities to demonstrate positive behavior: (a) responses to particular items; and (b) the written analysis. This is especially important for assessing decisionmaking skills.

The eleven dimensions observable during this exercise are shown in Appendix A. This exercise is the primary means for evaluating managerial and decisionmaking dimensions. It is also an opportunity to assess the written communication dimension.

The National Executive Exercise

This competitive group exercise has been used extensively in other executive-level assessment centers developed by DDI (Development Dimensions International). This exercise is considered competitive because six participants role playing Executive Directors of a developing country's six major governmental Bureaus are given the two-fold task of securing as much as possible of a $10 million budget surplus for their own Bureau, while at the same time helping the Council swiftly reach a decision that is in the best interest of the country. Prior to the 75-minute Council meeting, participants are given one hour to study statistics and background information on the country and a portfolio of the projects recommended by their own Bureau. The substance of this exercise seems particularly relevant to major aspects of the AWC curriculum. The exercise materials for the National Executive Council Exercise include:

- Instructions for Participant

- Participant Report Form

- Self-Assessment Report Form--Part I

- Classification by Dimension of Behavior Exhibited During the NEC exercise

- Self-Assessment Report Form--Part II

- Self-Assessment Report Form--Parts III, IV, and V

- Participant Questionnaire--Reaction to the NEC exercise.

The six dimensions observable in this exercise are shown in Appendix A. This exercise is one of the primary means for assessing leadership dimensions and Oral Communication Skill and a secondary means of assessing the dimensions of Analysis and Oral Presentation Skill. The fact that participants operate in a non-military setting is an advantage. DDI has found that since leadership and communication dimensions are basically interactive in nature, purer assessments of them can be obtained when participants are not experts or experienced in the content aspects of the discussion. Thus, this exercise may have less face validity, but considerable actual validity.

The Emphasis Given Dimensions During the Assessment Center Exercises

The dimensions of Analysis and Judgment are given a major emphasis in the assessment center. This is based upon the view (confirmed by the job analysis interviews) that executives are often placed in positions providing them with more and more varied information and requiring a broader perspective than others. The information sources are typical of those available to military executives--namely, verbal and quantitative reports, complaints, problems and anecdotal data. In some items participants must interrelate information from various sources to draw conclusions and make decisions. In other items, the pertinent facts are given within the memos of a single item, making perspective (Judgment) of critical importance. Since executives' jobs are fairly unstructured, in some cases, there are no evident demands (e.g., due dates) for decisions or actions requiring the participant to demonstrate initiative.

The dimensions of Time Management, Planning and Organizing, Group Leadership, and Negotiation are given a major emphasis within particular exercises because they are considered pertinent to the transition to military executive-level positions. As individuals move up in organizations, new demands are placed on their abilities to manage time, plan and use resources effectively, resolve conflicts, and build cooperation and teamwork because they control more re-sources, manage staffs with more dissimilar functions, and reach agreements with peers with conflicting goals. While communication dimensions, Delegation, Management Control, and Individual Leader-ship (as it is more narrowly defined in this dimension) are impor-tant and relevant at executive levels, they are also required in middle management and/or supervisory positions. It is believed that participants will be more experienced, more knowledgeable about their performance, and developed in these latter skill areas. While not neglecting these areas, transitional skills are emphasized since feedback on them will be more useful and more frequently the basis for change. Clearly, data from the job analysis interviews supports this.

It may be noted that many dimension labels are the same as those used during the Command and General Staff College Assessment Center and the ROTC Leadership Assessment Program. This may be misleading. In some cases, there is similarity in labels because the same skills are required at all ranks with a greater proficiency needed at higher ones. To account for this, the Army War College exercises are more complex, making it more difficult to demonstrate positive dimension-related behavior. The dimensions of Analysis and Judgment are prime examples. In other cases, the behaviors classified under the dimension of Planning and Organizing for a lieutenant's exercise involve developing schedules. The planning and organizing behaviors required in AWC exercises are quite different. In still other cases, there are different dimensions expressing skills unique to or more important at higher levels (e.g., Negotiation, Group Leadership, and Time Management). In terms of the reliability and validity of the assessment, the dimension labels are relatively unimportant. What is important is that the set of dimensions employed is a logical system that can be reliably used by assessors to capture and classify

57

aspects of performance relevant to a particular position or rank.

Reaction to the Assessment Center

The purpose of this questionnaire is to obtain participants' re-action to the Assessment Center. A participant questionnaire provides the participant results and impact with the opportunity to describe opinions concerning results and impact of the Assessment Center on the individual.

DIMENSIONS OBSERVABLE BY EXERCISE

	CHIEF OF STAFF EXERCISE		NATIONAL EXEC- UTIVE COUNCIL EXERCISE
	In-Basket	Analysis	
Oral Communication Skill			X
Oral Presentation Skill			X
Written Communication Skill	X	X	
Analysis	X	X	X
Judgment	X	X	
Organizational Sensitivity	X		
Time Management	X		
Planning & Organizing	X	X	
Delegation	X		
Management Control	X		
Initiative	X		X
Individual Leadership	X	X	
Group Leadership	X		X
Negotiation			X
Interpersonal Sensitivity			X

SYLLABUS   ACADEMIC YEAR 1984

ADVANCED COURSES PROGRAM

EXECUTIVE SKILLS:
ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

US ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA   17013
26 March 1984--31 May 1984

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY WAR COLLEGE
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

AWCAA   26 March 1984

SUBJECT: Syllabus, "Executive Skills: Assessment and Development,"
Advanced Course, Academic Year 1984.

TO: SEE DISTRIBUTION

This document is prepared solely for use by the staff, faculty, and students
of the US Army War College. It is not for general distribution and may not
be released to other persons, quoted or extracted for publication, or otherwise
copied or distributed without specific permission from the Commandant, US Army
War College, in each instance.

FOR THE COMMANDANT:

                                    WILLIAM T. LEGGETT, JR.
                                    Colonel, Infantry
                                    Secretary/Chief of Staff

DISTRIBUTION:
U3
Proponent-65

TABLE OF CONTENTS

US ARMY WAR COLLEGE
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

SYLLABUS
ADVANCED COURSE   26 March 1984

EXECUTIVE SKILLS: ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

EXECUTIVE SKILLS: ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

SECTION I

COURSE DESCRIPTION

1. OBJECTIVE. To provide each student with an assessment of selected senior leadership and managerial skills and to enhance competence in selected skill areas.

2. SCOPE. In 1981, a study was accomplished to identify frequently occurring and important job behaviors which are critical to successful performance in colonel/brigadier general positions and to identify important and representative job tasks and activities of officers in senior-level positions in order to simulate them so that the level of skill in these areas could be assessed through different exercises. This course will concentrate on a number of these critical skills shown to be valuable for effective performance as senior Army leaders and managers. Initially, students will be given the opportunity to assess themselves in these areas through the use of an In-Basket and Analysis Exercise in which the participant is a newly-appointed Chief of Staff and Headquarters Troop Commander, and a competitive group exercise.

Following the individual's self-assessment of his/her level of skills, the course will then focus on improving performance in selected skills areas which include time management, problem solving, communications, negotiations, and decisionmaking.

3. PREREQUISITES. None.

4. METHODOLOGY. This course is developed through assessment exercises, short lectures, group discussion, films, case studies, and required readings.

5. COURSE REQUIREMENT. As a general requirement, each student should complete reading assignments and be prepared to participate in discussions and practical exercises. As a specific requirement, each student will complete the self-assessment exercise--In-Basket Exercise--outside of class and will be required to conduct a project concerning refinements to the assessment exercise and develop a short case study concerning one or multiple skill areas.

6. COURSE RELATIONSHIPS. This course supplements the studies in the Requirements of the Professional course. Since it emphasizes leadership and managerial skills which affect level of performance, it supports all aspects of the curriculum. It has relevance to the entire range of OPMS specialities, command, supervision of an organizational activity, and service or joint staff positions.

7. DETAILED PROGRAM.

a. The planning calendar on page 3 indicates the schedule of classes and the subjects to be covered.

b. Detailed instructions and information are provided on the course description pages following the planning calendar.

8. FACULTY ORGANIZATION.

Chairman, Department of Command,
   Leadership, and Management..............COL Charles A. Beitz, Jr.

Advanced Course Instructors..............Dr. Herbert F. Barber
                                         Room No. C-312
                                         Phone: 4014

                                         COL Charles A. Beitz, Jr.
                                         Room No. C-302
                                         Phone: 4815

PLANNING CALENDAR

EXECUTIVE SKILLS: ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Academic Year 1984

THURSDAY, 29 MAR	THURSDAY, 5 APR	THURSDAY, 12 APR	WEDNESDAY, 18 APR
ESAD-01 COURSE ORIENTATION AND OVERVIEW OF AWC EXECUTIVE SKILLS ASSESSMENT CENTER DEV	ESAD-02 IN-BASKET AND ANALYSIS EXERCISE--EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION	ESAD-03 NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL EXERCISE & REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE	ESAD-04 TIME MANAGEMENT
WEDNESDAY, 25 APR	THURSDAY, 3 MAY	THURSDAY, 10 MAY	THURSDAY, 17 MAY
ESAD-05 NEGOTIATION SKILLS	ESAD-06 DECISIONMAKING	ESAD-07 CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING	ESAD-08 MANAGING GROUPS
	THURSDAY, 24 MAY	THURSDAY, 31 MAY	
	ESAD-09 COMMUNICATION SKILLS	ESAD-10 ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT AND SUMMARY	

SECTION II

CLASS DESCRIPTIONS

ESAD-01: Thursday, 29 March 1984. <u>Course Orientation and Overview of AWC Executive Skills and Assessment Center Development</u>. This first period will be devoted primarily to an overview of the entire course and the two assessment center exercises and the .selected executive skills in the course. The remainder of the session will cover the assessment center concept, a senior level job analysis study conducted for AWC in 1981, and a behavioral observation system.

    <u>Required Reading</u>:

        Faculty Instructor Handout.

<center>* * * * *</center>

ESAD-02: Thursday, 5 April 1984. <u>In-Basket and Analysis Exercise--Evaluation and Discussion</u>. This period will be devoted to an individual evaluation of the student's responses to 31 memoranda and letters in the in-basket exercise. Acting as a newly appointed Chief of Staff and Headquarters Troop Commander of a fictitious U.S. Army Research and Evaluation Command, students will have completed, out of class, the actual exercise. The remainder of the period will be a discussion of the exercise.

    <u>Required Reading</u>:

        Faculty Instructor Handout

ESAD-03: Thursday, 12 April 1984. <u>The National Executive Council Exercise and Review of Performance</u>. This period is devoted to the conduct of a group exercise in which the students role play executive directors of a developing country's six major governmental bureaus. Prior to the 75-minute videotaped council meeting, students will be given the opportunity to study statistics and background information on the country and a portfolio of the projects recommended by their own bureau. The remainder of the period will be a review of the performance during the exercise.

    <u>Required Reading</u>:

        None.

<center>* * * * *</center>

ESAD-04: Wednesday, 18 April 1984. <u>Time Management</u>. Techniques for improving your management of time will be examined. Topics will include common time wasters, examining personal time habits, and time management strategies.

    <u>Required Readings</u>:

        Acker, David D. "Delegating Authority. Even When You're All Tied Up, It's Not Too Late to Begin." <u>Program Manager</u>, Vol. 9, January-February 1980, pp. 15-20.

<center>66</center>

MacKenzie, R. Alex. "Toward A Personalized Time Management Strategy." <u>Management Review</u>, Vol. 63, February 1974, pp. 10-14.

<p align="center">*   *   *   *   *</p>

ESAD-05: Wednesday, 25 April 1984. <u>Negotiation Skills</u>. The process of negotiation on both a personal and organizational level will be examined. Identification of .potential negotiation situations, planning for negotiations, and negotiation tactics will be covered.

<u>Required Reading</u>:

Hill, Roy. "The Subtle Art of Negotiation" <u>International Management</u>, Vol. 34, September 1979, pp. 28-30.

<p align="center">*   *   *   *   *</p>

ESAD-06: Thursday, 3 May 1984. <u>Decisionmaking</u>. The cognitive decisionmaking process will be discussed. Rational decisionmaking strategies will be examined.

<u>Required Reading</u>:

Carson, Ian. "How Top Men Make Up Their Minds." <u>International Management</u>, Vol. 26, April 1971, pp. 20-24.

<p align="center">*   *   *   *   *</p>

ESAD-07: Thursday, 11 May 1984. <u>Creative Problem Solving</u>. The creative process as it applies to generating alternative solutions or ideas will be examined. Blocks to creativity and strategies to develop, encourage, and reward creative problem solving will be discussed.

<u>Required Readings</u>:

Hatch, Kenneth M., "Creative Thinking and the Military Profession." <u>Military Review</u>, Vol. 46, August 1966, pp. 78-86.

Souder, William E., and Ziegler, Robert W. "A Review of Creativity and Problem Solving Techniques." <u>Research Management</u>, Vol. 20, July 1977, pp. 34-42.

<p align="center">*   *   *   *   *</p>

ESAD-08: Thursday, 17 May 1984. <u>Managing Groups</u>. Selected group management skills will be examined. Topics to be covered include: managing group conflict, organizational change and managing meetings.

<u>Required Readings</u>:

Acker, David D. "Successful Meetings Don't Just Happen." <u>Program Manager</u>, Vol. 8, September-October 1979, pp. 8-16.

<p align="center">67</p>

Acker, David D. "Managing Conflict At Work." Program Manager, Vol. 9, July-August 1980, pp. 6-12.

* * * * *

ESAD-09: Thursday, 24 May 1984. Communication Skills. Two specific topics will be covered: Speech preparation and presentation and interviewing. Techniques for writing a formal speech and effective presentation styles (including non-verbal aspects) will be covered. Personnel interviewing (i.e., hiring, firing) will be examined.

Required Readings:

Ginsburg, Sigmund C. "Preparing for Executive Position Interviews: Questions the Interviewer Might Ask--Or Be Asked." Personnel, Vol. 57, July-August 1980, pp. 31-36.

Hayes, James L. "Speaking of Speaking." Management Review, Vol. 70, September 1981, pp. 2-3.

Farnsworth, Terry. "Figures of Speech." International Management, Vol. 34, March 1979, pp. 38-43.

* * * * *

ESAD-10: Thursday, 31 May 1984. Organizational Context and Summary. Specific special issues relevant to senior military executives will be discussed. These include: The bureaucratic environment, establishing an organizational climate, reward systems, organizational sensitivity, and new managerial trends.

Required Readings:

Alexander, Tom. "Why Bureaucracy Keeps Growing." Fortune, Vol. 99, May 7, 1979, pp. 164-176.

Kerr, Steven. "On the Folly of Rewarding A, While Hoping for B." Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 18, December 1975, pp. 769-783.

END

DATE
FILMED

9-88

DTIC